AMENDED MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

TWELVE OAKS MEDICAL CENTER FRANCIS ORR & TOTUSEK LLP 103 EAST VIRGINIA SUITE 203 MCKINNEY TX 75069

Carrier's Austin Representative Box #19

Respondent Name

FIDELITY & GUARANTY INSURANCE CO

MFDR Date Received

JUNE 15, 2006

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-06-6590-02

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Dated June 14, 2006: "As required by law, Twelve Oaks Medical Center billed its usual and customary charges for its services. The total sum billed was \$45,371.45...reimbursement for the entire admission including charges for items in (c)(4) is calculated by the stop-loss reimbursement factor stated in the ACIHFG, i.e., 75%...Therefore, the fees paid by United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company do not conform to the reimbursement section of Rule 134.401...it is the position of Twelve Oaks Medical Center that all charges related to the admission of...are due and payable as provided for under Texas law and the Rules of the Division, as currently adopted and published at 28 TAC §134.400, et seq."

Requestor's Supplemental Position Summary Dated June 22, 2007: "NOTICE OF SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL...This firm and the undersigned have been retained by Twelve Oaks Medical Center ('TOMC'). located in Houston, Texas, to represent TOMC in its effort to secure payment for the medical services and goods provided to the Claimant in reference to the above-captioned workers' compensation medical dispute resolution matter."

Amount in Dispute: \$26,341.56

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary dated July 5, 2006: "Requestor billed a total of \$45,371.45. The Requestor asserts it is entitled to reimbursement in the amount of \$34,028.59, which is 75% of the total charges...To qualify for stop loss, the services provided by the hospital must be unusually costly to the hospital as opposed to unusually priced to the carrier. The services provided by the hospital (not by a physician attending a patient while in the hospital) must be unusually extensive...There is no evidence submitted by the hospital demonstrating that the services provided by the hospital were unusually extensive...Secondly, there is no evidence that the services provided by the hospital were unusually costly to the hospital."

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated September 12, 2011: "Based upon Respondent's initial and all supplemental responses, and in accordance with the Labor Code and Division rules, Requestor has failed to sustain its burden of proving entitlement to the stop-loss exception."

Response Submitted by: Flahive, Ogden & Latson on behalf of Fidelity & Guaranty Insurance Company

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
June 24, 2005 through June 25, 2005	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$26,341.56	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This **amended** findings and decision supersedes all previous decisions rendered in this medical payment dispute involving the above requestor and respondent.

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

- 1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to requests filed on or after January 1, 2003, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
- 2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.
- 3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, 27 *Texas Register* 4047, effective May 16, 2002, sets out the guidelines for a fair and reasonable amount of reimbursement in the absence of a contract or an applicable division fee guideline.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

- P8F This contracted provider or hospital has agreed to reduce this charge below fee schedule or usual and customary charges for your business. (P303)
- ZFK The charge for this procedure exceeds the fee schedule or usual and customary allowance. (Z560)
 ZG9 The charge for this procedure exceeds the health facility fee schedule assigned by the Texas Workers Compensation Commission. (Z585)
- ZJB The charges for this hospitalization have been reduced based on the fee schedule allowance. (Z696)
- B13 Previously paid. Payment for this claim/service may have been provided in a previous payment.
- 24 Payment for charges adjusted. Charges are covered under a capitation agreement/managed care plan.
- 42 Charges exceed our fee schedule or maximum allowable amount.
- F4Y Hospital previously contracted under a different plan. The system will price the bill according to the appropriate contract. (F178)
- ZFH This contracted hospital has agreed to reduce this charge below fee scheduled or usual and customary charges for your business. For services regarding the First Health Contract, please call 800-937-6824. (Z557)
- ZFL The charge for this procedure exceeds the fee schedule or usual and customary allowance. (Z560)
- W1 Workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment.
- 45 Charges exceed your contracted/legislated fee arrangement.

Issues

- 1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
- 2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
- 3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
- 4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 *South Western Reporter Third* 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges

exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The supplemental information was shared among the parties as appropriate. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges *in this case* exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services *in this case* are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services *in this case* are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

- 1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed." Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal \$45,371.45. The division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
- 2. The requestor in its position statement presumes that it is entitled to the stop loss method of payment because the audited charges exceed \$40,000. As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals in its November 13, 2008 opinion rendered judgment to the contrary. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved...unusually extensive services." The requestor failed to demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitute unusually extensive services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor did not meet 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6).
- 3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the requestor presumes that because the bill exceeds \$40,000, the stop loss method of payment should apply. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must *demonstrate* that an admission involved unusually costly services thereby affirming 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) which states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The requestor failed to demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitutes unusually costly services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor failed to meet 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6).
- 4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(b)(2)(A) titled General Information states, in pertinent part, that "The basic reimbursement for acute care hospital inpatient services rendered shall be the lesser of:
 - (i) a rate for workers' compensation cases pre-negotiated between the carrier and the hospital;
 - (ii) the hospital's usual and customary charges; and
 - (iii) reimbursement as set out in section (c) of this section for that admission

In regards to a pre-negotiated rate, the services in dispute were reduced in part with the explanation "Payment for charges adjusted. Charges are covered under a capitation agreement/managed care plan." No documentation was provided to support that a reimbursement rate was negotiated between the workers' compensation insurance carrier Fidelity and Guaranty Insurance Co. and Twelve Oaks Medical Center prior to the services being rendered; therefore 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(b)(2)(A)(i) does not apply.

In regards to the hospital's usual and customary charges in this case, review of the medical bill finds that the health care provider's usual and customary charges equal \$45,371.45.

In regards to reimbursement set out in (c), the division determined that the requestor failed to support that the services in dispute are eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement; therefore 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1), titled Standard Per Diem Amount, and §134.401(c)(4), titled Additional Reimbursements, apply. The division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.

 Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission." The length of stay was one day. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of one day results in an allowable amount of \$1,118.00.

• 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(A), states "When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274)." Review of the requestor's medical bill finds that the following items were billed under revenue code 278 and are therefore eligible for separate payment under §134.401(c)(4)(A):

Description of Implant per Itemized Statement	Quantity	Cost Invoice	Cost + 10%
Temp Fixation Pn	1	\$141.00	\$155.10
1 Lvl Sttr Plate	1	\$781.00	\$859.10
1.8mm Lckng Scrw	1	\$29.50	\$32.45
4.0X14 SLF Drl	1	\$274.00	\$301.40
9mm Cancellous	1	\$1,143.75	\$1,258.13
Total			\$2,606.18

• 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states "Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time." A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$329.00/unit for Vancomycin. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these items billed under revenue code 250. For that reason, additional reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended

The total reimbursement set out in the applicable portions of (c) results in \$1,118.00 + \$2,606.18, for a total of \$3,724.18.

Reimbursement for the services in dispute is therefore determined by the lesser of:

§134.401(b)(2)(A)	Finding	
(i)	Not Applicable	
(ii)	\$45,371.45	
(iii)	\$3,724.18	

The division concludes that application of the standard per diem amount and the additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) represents the lesser of the three considerations. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$4,694.74. Based upon the documentation submitted, additional reimbursement can not be recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled Standard Per Diem Amount, and §134.401(c)(4) titled Additional Reimbursements are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 additional reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Authorized Signature		
		12/19/2013
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party**.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.